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BIBLIOGRAPHY
Introduction

In the past twenty-five years substantial progress has been made in the study of Proto-Indo-European nominal morphology. Our understanding of the intricate relationships between accent and ablaut, and between the various accentual paradigms, i.e. acrostatic, proterokinetic, hysteroelastic and amphikinetic has greatly increased thanks to the pioneering works of Eichner, Rix, Schindler and others.¹

In this same period of time, the philological and linguistic study of Italic has also made considerable strides. New evidence has been discovered. The South Picene texts have been deciphered by Anna Marinetti. Umbrian historical phonology has been ably handled by Gerhard Meiser.

In light of these developments, it seemed to me a worthwhile project to attempt to synthesize the gains of the theory of PIE nominal morphology and the gains of Italic studies. In what follows, I take a small first step towards the completion of a much larger project. In the first part of this thesis, I examine the etymological and morphological problems presented by the root nouns of Oscan, Umbrian and South Picene which may be referred to henceforth by the cover term Sabellic. In the second part, I

examine the neuter -u- stems of Sabellic in the same fashion. Although my chief interest is Italic nominal morphology, I have not shied away from discussing matters non-Italic, verbal or phonological, if they seemed of sufficient relevance and interest.
PART I: The Root-Nouns of Sabellic

Proto-Italic *frūk-s frūg-es

Proto-Italic *frūk-s frūg-es f. is securely reconstructable on the basis of Latin frūx 'useful thing'\(^1\) > 'grain' (Enn. +) with a nom. s. by-form frūgis (Varro L. 9.75)\(^2\) and a predicative dative used as an indeclinable adjective, frūgi 'honest' literally 'for a use' and on the basis of Umbrian frīf and inī 'fruges' acc. pl. T.I., vi a 42 etc.\(^3\)

\(^1\)A meaning still preserved in the idiom frugem facere 'do the right thing', e.g. Plautus Poen. 892 eru tuo si volit facere frugem, meum erum perdet. 'If your master wants to do the right thing, he'll ruin my master'.

\(^2\)The phenomenon of a new -i- stem nominative replacing an original root noun nominative is paralleled by vehis 'wagon-load' (cf. Umbrian vei) etc. This may be by analogy with acrostatic -i- stems where the nominative -is and the genitive -is would have been the same from Proto-Indo-European times. A very good candidate for acrostatic -i- stem inflexion is hostis 'stranger, enemy' since the o-grade also found in Gothic gasts 'guest', OCS gosti'-guest' points to an acrostatic paradigm. An analogy which could have produced forms like frugis etc. would be as follows: hostis gen. : hostis nom. :: frugis gen. : X, X = frugis nom. This scenario assumes that this analogy did not take place until after the change of *-es# to -is#, but the analogy could also have worked before this in a somewhat more abstract form: hostis gen. : hostis nom. :: *fruges gen. : X, X= *fruges and then by sound change > frugis.

\(^3\)Oscan has fruktatluf 'fructus' < *frūg-etā-tjōn- from which can be inferred the existence of a verb *frūg-etā-. The expected Latin equivalent *frugitare has been replace by fruitare, on the basis of the innovated p.p.p. fruitus.
Germanic *brükiz 'useful'

The closest cognates to Italic *trük-s are found in Germanic, which has an -i- stem adjective *brükiz 'useful' (Goth. bruks, OHG bruhi, OE bryce) alongside *unbrükiz 'useless' (Gothic unbruks, OE unbryce). Given the relative scarcity of -i- stem adjectives in Germanic, it is not unlikely that *brükiz is a back-formation from the negative *unbrükiz where the -i- stem is well-paralleled in the second part of a bahuvrihi.4

Cf. the well-known pattern of Latin arma 'arms', inermis 'unarmed', Olr. nert 'strength', sonirt 'strong' and especially Greek γλαυκώπτες -iōs acc. -os and -iō with gleaming eyes (Hom. +) where an -id- stem (< -i- stem) replaces the root noun acc. sg. ἀπα 'eye' in the second part of a compound. It is therefore possible that a root noun *brūks can be inferred from *-brükiz.5

---

4Note that most Gothic -i- stem adjectives are compounds or occur beside compounds. Thus gamains common', analaghs 'hidden', anasiuns 'visible', andanems 'acceptable', andasets 'horrible', gafuurs 'sober', unfauurs 'gossipy', and aljakuns 'of foreign origin' are all compound. Hrains 'pure', sels 'virtuous' and bruks 'useful' all occur beside the negative bahuvrihis unhrains 'impure', unsels 'evil' and unbruks 'useless' respectively. Only skaïrs 'clear' does not seem to occur beside a compound. See Braune-Ebbinghaus GG, p. 83, and Kluge, p. 86.

5Similarly Sommer iā Stämme, p. 225. It is, however, equally possible that *-brükiz replaces some other stem class.
The problem of *fruor

*Bhruh₂-g-s 'use' occurred beside the primary verb *bhruh₂-g-je-/o- 'use' (Gothic brukjan). Given the deponent inflexion of Latin fruor, it is highly likely that the intransitive -je- present which is seen in Gothic brukjan and which is common in deponent verbs (cf. e.g. Skt. mányate 'thinks' = Grk. μανίκετα 'is mad' = OIr. do.moinethar 'opines') once existed in the pre-history of Latin. But the exact mechanism of the replacement of phonologically expected *frūjetor < *bhruh₂-g-jetor by fruitur is obscure.

Szemerényi has suggested that the expected *frūjetor became *frūjetor with reduction of a double consonant after a long vowel, and that single intervocalic j was then lost, giving *frūjetor > fruitur.⁶ But this account runs into difficulties of chronology: loss of single intervocalic yod was, in all probability, a Proto-Italic phenomenon, to judge from the fact that neither Latin nor any Sabellic language ever retains any trace of it (cf. iovesat 'swears' already on the Duenos inscription from *iejvesajetid), whereas the simplification of consonant clusters after long vowels is an ongoing process in the history of Latin. Even Augustus is said to have preferred the spelling caussa to causa (Quint Inst. 1.7.20)

⁶O. Szemerényi, Quellen, p. 39.
and this is supported by the evidence of the *Monumentum Ancyra.* Szemerényi could, of course, maintain that as new single intervocalic yod arose a new yod loss rule eliminated them. But this would be totally *ad hoc.*

It seems, therefore, that *frueor* must originate analogically. To my mind, the most plausible source for an analogical model is the family of *fluo, fluxi, fluxus* 'flow', *flūmen* 'river', *flūctus* 'wave, billow' which itself owes some of its forms to the analogical influence of *frueor.*

First of all, it should be noted that *fluo* etc. cannot be from a PIE *bhleug*-1. There is simply no good evidence for this root. The Greek forms normally cited in this connection, *oivó-φλυξ* 'given to drinking' (Hipp. +), *φλυκω* (apparently first in Nic.) 'boil over', *φλυκτίς* 'blister' (Hipp. +), *φλυκτών* 'blister' (Hipp. +) are ambiguous since the could come from either *bhleug*- or *bhleug-*, and the meaning is hardly an exact match. Outside of Greek there is absolutely no evidence for a root *bhleug*- or *bhleug-*. In fact, as I will argue in detail in the excursus on *iūgis*, labiovelars were not permitted after -u- in PIE and any such sequences that arose as the result of the combination of morphemes were dissimilated to -uku-.

Instead, *fluo* can only be from the root *bhleuχ*- (Lith. blia[iu] bliati,

---

7As W-H, I, p. 520, argue.
Latv. bl’āut 'roar', OCS bl’uŋ 'spit, vomit', Grk. φλύω 'boils over', ἐπιφλύω 'sputters at' (long u)). This root would regularly account for *fluo (Sent. Minuc. confluont) < *bhleyhx-e,9 flumen < *fluya-men < *bhleyhx-mη or < *bhluhx-mη, flor 'a morbid discharge' < *bhluhx-ōs (cf. cruor 'gore' < *kruhxōs), and fluvius / fluvis 'river' < *bhleyhx-ōjōs etc.

On the other hand, an analogical explanation will be necessary for confluence 'confluences' (Liv. Andr.), fluctus 'billow, wave', fluxi and fluxus. Confluentes could have been created on any one of several analogies, e.g. contāmen10 'contamination' < *kom-tag-s-men : contāgēs 'contact' or exāmen 'a swarm' < *eks-ag-s-men: ambāgēs

8For the semantic connection with OCS bl’uŋ 'spit, vomit', cf. fluo in the sense 'flow (of bodily fluids)' in Plautus Mos. 1109: num mucci fluont? 'I suppose it's not possible that the snot is flowing?' and elsewhere.

9The regular fluo may have been generalized from the compound confluo etc. where -uy-V- was regularly reduced to -uy-V- in non accented position. Cf. plure 'to rain' which must have been extracted from compounds like impluere 'to rain in' etc where the development of *-ployeti (< *ployeti, which is traditionally compare to Grk. πλούω 'I sail' despite semantic difficulties) to -pluit- in a non-accented syllable was regular. On the other hand, confluent is considered to be purely graphic by Niedermann, Mél. Saussure, p. 60. If this is the case then fluo would be directly from *fluye- < *bhluhx-e-. See W-H, I, p. 520.

10Contāmen is not actually attested until Tertullian, but its prior existence must be supposed on the basis of the verb contāminare (Ter. and Acc. +). See Perrot, p. 48-49.
'circumlocution' :: flūmen : X, X = -flūgēs. The creation of a form with a non etymological -g- is precisely paralleled by the case of strāgēs a 'confused mass', strāgulus 'clothes used as blankets'. The root meaning of these word is 'strewage' and they must therefore be connected with the root of sterno, sternere, strāvi, strātus' I strew *sterh₂- (Gk. aor.  ēstrēpēsēa by metathesis < *e-sterh₂s- etc.) But since there is no evidence for -g- extended *sterh₂g-, one would prefer to offer an inner-Latin explanation for strāgēs and strāgulus. In light of what has been said just above, it is clear that these forms were created on the analogy ex-ē-men: amb-ēg-ēs vel sim. :: strē-men 'straw' : X, X = strāgēs.

Once a -g- had been introduced into con-fluges, it was quite simple for this to spread to other parts of this family on the basis of analogies of various sorts, e.g. frūgēs: frūctus :: -fluges : X, X = flūctus and then

---

11Contages is , of course, singular with both fifth declension (e.g. contāgē (Lucr. 3.734)) and third declension forms (e.g. contāge (Lucr. 4.336 etc)). Ambāgēs is a pluralē tantum in archaic texts. Singular forms apparently do not appear before Ovid, e.g. Met. 8.161 ambāge. Perhaps the precisest formal model would have been frūmen 'sacrificial mush' < *frūg-s-men: frūgēs :: flūmen : flūgēs. The only problem is that frūmen is not attested before Arnobius. But it may, in fact, be a much older form which Arnobius took from some work on religious antiquities.

12W-H, II, p. 600 compare Lith. strōga sāulēs 'sunbeam' but this can only be from *streh₂geh₂ with a different laryngeal.

ductus 'leadership' : duxi 'I led' or luctus 'mourning' : luxi 'I mourned' ::

fūctus : X, X = fūxi.\(^{14}\)

When this state of affairs had been reached fluctus : fluens could have served as the model for the creation of fruens on the basis of fructus. From the present participle a new present fruitur was created which, however, retained deponent inflection.\(^{15}\) One can even point to a certain degree of semantic overlap between fluo and fruar, e.g. Vell. 2.88.2: Maecenas otio ac mollitiis paene ultra feminam fluens 'Maecenas enjoying leisure and luxury almost more than a woman' would differs little in sense if one read fruens. Cf. also Sen. Dial.1.1.6: voluptatibus fluere vs. Plin. Ep.8.52: fruendis voluptatibus.\(^{16}\)

Latin created at least one other innovative present of the fruar type - namely, fīvo 'I fix' an archaic by-form of figo (fīvere item pro fīgere

\(^{14}\)The pt. pass. ptc. flunctus (attested by the grammarian Priscian) was replaced by fluxus on the analogy clau-sī 'I closed' < *klaud-sai: clausus 'closed' < *klaud-to- (vel sim. cf. also pressī: pressus, cessī, cessus etc.): fluk-sī: fluk-sus.

\(^{15}\)Cf. also the bedeutungsverwandt deponents utor, potior, fungor and vescor. The alternation pres. -yō perf. -ksī has also created new unetymological perfects in -ksī in the cases of struo : struxi and vivo : vivī.

\(^{16}\)It is also interesting to note that fructus can be used of liquids, e.g. Plautus Pseudolus 782 cras mini potandus fructus est fullonius 'Tomorrow I'll have to drink launderer's liquid' as has been convincingly demonstrated by M. Kwintner, CPh, 1992, p. 232-233.
Paul. *Fest. p. 92 M). This is generally taken as evidence that the proto-
form was *dhīh₃ g²-. But there is no evidence for this labio-velar outside
of Latin. Lith. d'ygšt 'keimen' is, of course, ambiguous, but the Germanic
forms OE dīc m. 'canal', OS dīc, ON dīki n. 'well' point to a plain velar.
Therefore, it is preferable to find an analogical explanation for *fīvo . In the
light of what has been argued above the analogy vīxī:vīvō:: fīxi:: X
X= fīvō is not at all suprising. This analogical creation, however, was
destined to die an early death, since the phonological expected fīgo is the
regular form. Other forms often taken from a stem *fīyi- e.g. offimentum
'neck' (Gi.) ¹⁷ and fibula 'peg, pin'¹⁸ can just as well be taken from
*fīks-mentum and *fīks-dhīā.)

Semantics and Ablaut of *bhuh₃ g-s

Semantically, *bhuh₃ g-s can then be classified as a nomen actionis,
which according to Schindler originally shewed e/z ablaut in PIE. But as
Jasanoff has shown, certain roots in -ā- < *-uH- do not seem to ablaut.
Cf. e.g. the consistent zero-grade of *bhuh₃- 'be' even in the singular of
the root aorist (Ved. Skt., ábhūt, Grk. ἔφυ) and perfect (Ved. Skt.
babhūva, Olr. boi 'was' < *bhōyē < *bhēyē < *bhebhēyē < *bhebhu₂-

¹⁷See Perrot, p. 76 n. 4.
¹⁸e.g. by Solmsen, p. 116.
e), where e- and o-grade respectively are expected. To judge from the meager evidence, *bhrutawg- could also have been a root of this type.

frug-smentom and *frug-smen

The root noun frux, also makes the derivative seen in frumentum 'grain' (< *frug-smentom), perhaps originally a collective to the frumen (< *frug-smen) attested in Arnobius nat. 7.24 in the meaning 'sacrificial porridge'. Frumen : frumentum would thus constitute a pair parallel to unguen : ugmentum, but with *-smen- and *-smento- the frequent suffix by-forms seen in iumentum 'beast of burden' < *joug-smentom (cf. iouxmenta of the Forum inscription), exemen 'a swarm', < *eks-ag-smen- etc.20

---

19See J.H. Jasanoff, in FS Polomé, pp. 299-308.
20Note that suffix by-forms beginning with s are particularly common after roots ending in velars. For example - to cite another form built to the root *bhrutawg- - fruniscor is from *frug-sni-scor. and is not to be compared directly with conquiniscor 'to stoop down' which cannot be from *kʰek-sni- (cf. ON hvika 'niederhocken' and the perfect of conquiniscor, conquexi) since this could only result in *queni-. Instead conquiniscor is probably from *kom-kʰek-ni- > *kom-kʰê-ni- by dissimilation >> conquinisco.

This distribution of s-initial suffixes after velar roots seems to have existed already in PIE to judge from cases like finis 'boundary', finire 'to end' < *dʰigh-sni-(je) ~ Lith dyksnis 'Stich', and Umbrian persni- 'pray' < *perk-sni-je < *prek-sni- (cf. tertiam < *tritij-, but also *persclo < *perk-s-klo- < *prek-s-klo-. See Meiser, p. 134).
Proto-Italic *gʰou-s ‘cattle’

This root-noun is represented by Latin bōs which must have been borrowed from an Italic dialect, since gʰou-s should have given Latin *vōs or *vūs, and by Umbrian bum etc., and Volscian bim.

Umbrian bum etc.

The following forms of this noun occur on the TI: acc.s bum, abl. sg. bue, acc. pl. but / buf, gen. pl. buo. The stem of all these cases can be derived from a unitary pre-form *gʰō- which has been generalized from the acc. s. and pl. *gʰōm (Skt. gām) and *gʰōns (Skt. gāh).¹

Volscian bim

Volscian bim is from an immediate pre-form *būm. As Thurneysen has correctly observed *būm can only have come into existence under the influence of *sūm ‘pig’ acc. sg. ( > Umbr. sim).² The contamination


²Thurneysen, KS, I, p. 312. As a typological parallel he cited Olr. boin the accusative of bó ‘cow’ supposedly modelled after coin the accusative of cú ‘dog’. This is perhaps not a very good parallel. K. McConne, Olr. bó and the etymology of Buchet, Ériu, 42, 1991, pp. 37-44 has plausibly
of *gʰous by *sʰus is also found in Latin where the short -u- of Latin bubulcus 'neatherd' owes its existence to the short -u- of subulcus 'swineherd'. See the fuller discussion under *sʰus.³

Oscan Búvaianúd

The Oscan place name Búvaianúd (Vetter 150), an obvious derivative of Oscan*boy- 'cattle', occurs in an inscription from Bovianum Vetus and is obviously to be equated with this Latin name. Morphologically, Búvaiano- finds an exact parallel in Púmpaliano- (Vetter 11 etc.) 'of or belonging to Pompeii'. Just as *pompaiio- ( = Latin Pompeius) can be inferred from Púmpaliano-, so *boyaiio- can be inferred from Búvaiano-.

*Boyaiio- would presumably have meant 'of or relating to cattle', or with substantivization 'Cowtown'. An interesting problem is presented by the Latin representation of Oscan Búvaiano- as Bovianum. Since Púmpaliano- became Pompeianus in Latin, one would have expected *Boweianum. Perhaps Latin reflects a by-form *boviano- derived from

³Cf. possibly nom. sg. bus (Varro L. 8.74), although this form is sometimes emended to bous for the sake of the structure of Varro's argument. In any case, even if it were securely attested, it would be susceptible to various alternative explanations.
*boviyo-* of or relating to cattle'. Cf. Grk. ἀρᾶσ ὀπροκατο ṭ 'produced at the right season (Hes. +) beside ἀρᾶσ ὀπροκατο ṭ 'produced in season' (Hom. +).

Alan Nussbaum, however, has suggested a more economical solution: *Boyajiāno-* first became *boyejiāno-* exactly as *pompejiāno-* became *pompejiāno-. Next, *boyejiāno-* became boyejiāno- by the Mamilla ~ mamma rule (Leumann LG, p. 184) and then by regular development boyejiāno- i.e. Boviāno-. On the other hand, the double āi of pompejiāno- was protected from the effects of the Mamilla rule by the analogy of *pompejiāei* 'Pompei'. 
Proto-Italic *lēk-s, lēg-es 'law'

This root noun is securely reconstructed for Proto-Italic on the basis of Latin čex 'law', Oscan ligud 'law' (Vett. 2), and Marrucinian lixs (Vett. 218).¹

līganakdlīkeī 'legiferae'

In addition, *lēg- is the first member of the compound līganakdlīkeī 'legiferae', 'law-giver' (Vett. 147, the Agnone bronze). It is generally agreed that the last member of this compound is the root noun *dik-s 'sayer' found in Osc. med-ui:x 'an Oscan official' and Latin iu-dex 'judge', vin-dex 'avenger, defender' etc.² On the other hand, no satisfactory explanation has been given for the remaining segment -anak-. Perhaps the most often repeated explanation is due to Schwyzter who saw in -anak- a compound *an-ag- 'sayer' from the root of Latin aio 'I say' < *agiō, ad-ag-ium, 'saying'.³ This explanation,

¹For the spelling with <xs> cf. lexs (Lex. Bant., CIL I.582)
²The -e- of the Latin nominative singular iudex is, of course, a replacement of expected tiudix on the analogy artificis < *artifakes: artifex < *artifaks :: iudicus : X, X = iudex.
³RhM, 84, 1935, p.115ff. Osc. angetuzet 'proposuerint' (Vett. 2.20) may also belong here. This root is probably best reconstructed with a
Narten present *h₂ēgūti / *h₂ēg-ūti. In Greek the 3rd s. imperfect *h₂ēg-t became ἵ 'said' on the basis of which a new paradigm ἵμι (Dor. 3.sg. ἵτι Alcm. 139) was built. The perfect ἀν ἔγγετε 'bids' could be from *h₂ e-h₂ ōg-e or *h₂ e-h₂ oq-e. In Armenian the weak stem was generalized giving *h₂ag-giti. The final ᾳ of the root was devoiced before the ending of the 3rd s. giving *h₂ aŋt-ti and finally *h₂ aŋ-ti became by thematicization *aŋ-e-ti which became by regular phonological development ase 'say'. In Latin the weak stem was generalized and the athematic paradigm was replaced with a -e/o- present giving *h₂aŋje- > aio aiži-e-l. I can see no way to account for the a of Latin aio beginning with a root *h₁ēg- (as Klingenschmitt does, p. 137) since *h₁ēg- would become *eg- and *h₁ōg- would almost certainly become g-. (cf. gero 'I do' < *h₂ōg-es-e-, *h₁dŋt- > dens 'tooth'). Perhaps Klingenschmitt is thinking of the comparison of Latin apio 'fasten' with Hittite epzi, 'takes' < *h₁ēp-t-i, Skt. ēṇōti 'reaches' Aves. āfiā- 'attain' etc. In fact, there were probably two assonant and semantically related roots *h₂ap- 'join, fit' and *h₁ep- 'take hold of'. The root *h₂ ap- made an athematic present *h₂ apti which is directly attested by Hittite ḫapzi impersonal 'passen, sich fügen' (cf. also the nominal derivative ḫappešār 'joint, limb'). See Puvel HED, 3, pp. 113-114. In Latin, *h₂apti was replaced by *h₂apjeti which gave apio 'comprehendere vincula, in tu flaminum adligare 'to tie with a chain, to tie in the manner of the priests' (Paul ex Fest. p. 18 M). The p.p.p. to this verb *h₂ apto- became aptus 'tied, fitted' e.g. Enn. Ann. Sk. 332 vinculis...apta tied with chains'. On the other hand, the root *h₁ep- 'take' seems to have been a Narten root (i.e. a root which shows lengthened-grade for expected full-grade and full-grade for expected zero-grade) to judge from the long vowels of Skt. ēṇōti 'reaches', Aves. āfiā- 'attain' etc. But on Arm unim 'possess', see J. Schindler, HA, 90, 1976, p. 341. An athematic Narten present (or aorist?) may be directly reflected by Hittite epzi, appansi. In Latin, the imperfect or aorist *h₁ēp-m became the "perfect" (co)-ēpī 'i begin'. From *ēpī, a new p.p.p. aptus was formed on the analogy of fēcī: factus etc. From aptus the present apīscor 'to seize hold of' was formed on the analogy of pactus: pacīscor etc. F. O. Lindemann, BSL, 1974, 69,1, pp. 155-157 argues that aiio was created on the analogy *fēc-: *fakwe- :: *ēp- <
however, suffers from a serious flaw: it cannot explain why the etymological $g$ of *an-ag- was written with a <$k>$. This is particularly troubling inasmuch as the Agnone Bronze does have a letter $g$ (cf. líganakdíkei itself), and Schwyzer's supposed $k$ for $g$ occurs before a voiced consonant which one would expect to favor the retention of the original voicing. Meiser p. 128, following Schmidt KZ, 72, 1954, has recognized this difficulty and attempted to overcome it. According to Meiser, líganakdíkei is from *lēg-and-ag-it-iko- (cf. Lat. indigitare 'to invoke a deity' (Varro) ) which by syncope and anaptyxis became *lēganaktiko-. This became a consonant stem analogically, subsequently came under the folk etymological influence of -dik-, and was used as a feminine theonym. But, first of all, one may ask why this perfectly good -o- stem should have been remade as a consonant stem.

Furthermore, while 'law-sayer' might, in theory, be a good name for a goddess who establishes the laws, one should not forget that the law-

---

*$h_{1}eh_{1}og$- $X, X = '*a{	ext{j}}e- > ajje-$. But this requires a very early analogy since it could only have operated before the Proto-Italic assimilation of -$gi$- to -$ii$-. Furthermore, it seems that analogy usually worked in the opposite direction creating the new ē perfect in both Latin and Oscan e.g., *fakje-$fěc$- :: *kapje- $X, X = '*kěp$- (Latin cěpī), and *kapje- : *kěp :: *hapje- $X, X = '*hěp$- (Oscan.hipid). The existence of two rhyming and semantically related roots is paralleled by the case of *$h_{1}nef$- 'carry' and *$h_{2}nef$- 'reach' on which see below.
giving goddess of the Greeks and Romans was called the Law-bringer: Grk. θεσμοφόρος epithet of Demeter (Hdt. +) and Latin legítër epithet of Ceres (Verg. +).⁴

In view of these difficulties, it is perhaps worth considering another etymology for the mysterious ἀνακ-. Albrecht v. Blumenthal has proposed that ἀνακ- should be connected with PIE "h₂ nek- 'carry, reach, bring'.⁵ While the details of v.Blumenthal's explanation are clearly problematic, and were swiftly criticized by J. B. Hoffmann,⁶ the basic insight seems plausible enough to be worth a second look.

The reconstruction of initial laryngeal of this root is problematic. On the one hand, OIr. perf. ánaitic < *ánonke (= Skt. ēnāmsa) points to *

h₂ e-h₂ nonk-e.⁷⑧ On the other hand, Greek ἱεροκειν < *h₁ ne-

h₁ ḫk-e- points to h₁.⁹ The simplest solution, it seems to me, would

---

⁴Cf. also the idiom legem ferre 'to propose a law'. For examples see OLD s.v. fero 28.
⁵RhM, 85, 1936, pp.66-67.
⁶JB, 270, 1940, p. 77.
⁷But Hittite ḫenkzi 'bestows' is written occasionally ḫa-ink- (ḥainkánta and ḫaiktari, see Melchert, p. 24) and may not, in fact, be related, although Melchert takes it from *h₂ e-h₁ enk-.
⁸I assume that the second n in *h₂ e-h₂ nonk-e is simply the result of perseverance. Cf. the American dialectical pronunciation United States pointed out by C. Watkins.-
⁹It is not clear what the phonological treatment of a sequence *-VH₂C- would have been in Greek. See Peters, p. 193. But in a reduplicated form like *h₁ ne-h₁ ḫk-e- it is not unlikely that Rix's law
be to suppose that there were, in fact, two verbs: *h₁nekk- ‘carry’ (Grk. ἔφυκεν, Lith. nėšti, OCS nesti, Goth. br-ingan with Brugmann, IF, 12, 1901, p. 154.), and *h₂nēkk- ‘reach’ (OIr. ánaic, Skt. ānamśa, Att. διανεκής /diānekeós/ ‘continuous’< “reaching through”). Naturally, in most traditions these two root were quickly confused.

If one allows that *h₁nekk- ‘carry, bring’ was inherited into Proto-Italic beside *h₂nēkk- ‘reach’ (nanciscor ‘I get’ etc.), one could reconstruct

(H₁RC- > V₁RC) would have applied, either phonologically, assuming Rix’s Law was operative in internal position, or analogically with the sequence -h₁nkk being treated as if it were, in fact, initial.

10 Despite Meier-Brügger, Die Sprache, 33, 1987, p.102-107, who argues that Ionic and Koine διανεκής is the original and that Attic διανεκής is a hyper-Atticism. Instead, I assume an Attic-Ionic *dianekēs with the regular subsequent developments in the the two dialects.

11 This approach was first taken by R.S.P. Beekes, MSS, 38, 1979, p. 18, with whom I am in full agreement.

12 The formation of nanciscor is an interesting question. To begin with, three observations might be made:

1) The present nanciscor is a recent replacement of OLat. nancio / nancior (XII +).
2) It is not clear which perf. ptc. nactus or nactus is older, since they both occur from the earliest Latin.
3) Neither the root *h₂nēkk- nor its rhyme word *h₁nēkk- had a present in PIE. This is clear from the disagreement or non-existence of present stems in the various daughter languages. From *h₁nēkk- Baltic and Slavic have the obviously innovative simple thematic present *neše- (Lith. nėšti, OCS nesti), whereas Greek preserves a more archaic situation with suppletive φέρω supplying the present stem. From *h₂nēkk- Indo-Iranian has a *-ney- present (Skt. aśnōti, Aves. aśnaōti < *h₂gē-neu-ti), OIr. has an -i- reduplicated present *icc < *h₂ihi₂gē- (Jasanoff p.c.), Goth. has a preteroo-present *ganah ‘it suffices’. Arm.
Hasanem 'I arrive' is an inner-Armenian -ane- present. On these forms in general and hasanem in particular, see Klingenschmitt, p. 212-213.

In the light of these observations, it seems to me plausible to suggest that the stem of nancire is not, as is often said, from a nasal infix present *h₂ne- -n-ke-je- (cf. frango 'I break' < *bhr₂-n-ge-), but instead originates in a reduplicated aorist. It is clear that *h₁ne- had a reduplicated aorist (Grk. ἐνακτέω < *enēnke- < *h₁ne- -h₁p-ke- (cf. εἶπον 'I said' < *e-ye- -yk²te- = Skt. āvocam)) and that *h₂ne- had a root aorist (Ved. Skt. ānati < *e-h₂ne-ke, see K. Hoffmann, MSS, 22, 1957, pp. 121ff.). But considering the well-known tendency for rhyming forms to influence one another, it would not be surprising if *h₂ne- also had or acquired a reduplicated aorist *h₂ne- -h₂p-ke-. The existence or creation of such an aorist may be supported by GAves. 3s. injunctive ṇṣat (Y 51.16), although this interpretation is not without its phonological difficulties since, despite Strunk and Pirart, Aves. and Ved. Skt. vāha- (trisyllabic) can hardly be from anything but *h₂yeh₁pto-. See K. Strunk, 'Über Laryngale und einige redupliizierte Verbalstämmle', in Laryngaltheorie, pp. 563-582 esp. p. 572. Typologically the creation of a new aorist on the basis of a rhyming verb would be comparable to Grk. λαβωμα 'I take' aor. ξλαβων being replaced by λαμβάνω 'I take' on the basis of λαγχάνω 'I get' aor. ξλαχω. This aorist *h₂ne- -h₂p-ke- would regularly become in Latin *nānke- and with shortening by Osthoff's Law *nanke-. From this aorist a perf. ptc. could have been built *nank-tos. Finally a present nank-je- could have been built on the analogy of sanctum: sancire 'to ratify solemnly' vel. sim. The by-form nactus could simply have been formed after the analogy of the numerous nasal presents which delete the nasal infix in the perf. ptc.

It is also likely that this verb *h₂ne- played a part in the formation of the Umbrian -nki- perfect, as was first suggested by Sommer, IE, 43, 1909-1910, pp.40ff., although the exact prehistory of these forms remains obscure. If the creation of nank-je- was Proto-Italic - and there is nothing obvious to suggest that it could not have been - it would be tempting to suppose that the -nki- perfect originates in a verbal phrase made up of a verbal noun in the accusative plus the present of *nankje-. Such an idiom is attested in OLat, e.g. Gracch. Orat. 28 si nanciam populi desiderium 'if I should accomplish the people's
a nomen agentis root noun with zero-grade *h₁g⁻ occurring in the second part of a compound. But one would expect *h₁g⁻ to become *ank⁻ only in an accented syllable.¹³ Therefore a compound *lēg-h₁g⁻ *h₁g⁻-s ἰεσμοφόρος would be expected to have given Proto-Sabellic *iligensks but with analogical accented treatment of the second member,
as is not uncommon in compounds, *ilig-anks.¹⁴ Subsequently, when desire', and this construction is quite close semantically to the present perfect which 'represents an act as, at the time of speaking, completed' (Hale and Buck, p. 243.). Thus one might imagine a Pre-Umbrian phrase e.g. *kom-bihifijān ṵi nankī 'He accomplishes an announcement'. Since final nasals were very weakly sounded in Umbrian (see Buck GOU, p. 71), such a phrase might be pronounced *kom-bihifijānank̕īd with a nasalized vowel. By haplography and palatalization this would become *kom-bihifijāns̕ī. Cf. for a similar haplography, Grk. τετράχμου 'a four drachma piece' from τετράδραχμον. For the type of Verbal noun, cf. dividia 'vexation' (Acc. +) < dividō 'I separate'. Directly from this present stem *kom-bihifijāns̕ī a future perfect could have been derived by truncation of the present forming suffix -ī- and the addition of the future perfect morpheme -us- ultimately giving the Umbr. fut. perf. combifianus. Cf Umb.present stem /portē/-l vs. the future perfect stem /port-us/-l. From this form the -nk⁻- perfect would have been extended according to the following analogy: perf. ptc. *kombifiatō-: perfect stem combifiāns̕ēs-: porditō- 'poortectum': X, X = pordi-nš(e)-(Umbr. Fut. perf. purtiūus. Similarly Sommer, IF, 43, 1925-1926, p. 42. T.L. Markey, KZ, 98, 1985 pp. 260-268 essentially repeats Sommer's idea. K. Shields' explanation KZ 102,1 1989, pp. 74-81 is to my mind, implausible.

¹³In Meiser's formulation, p. 69, *g > an in initial syllable and en in non-initial syllables. But, since it is clear that the initial syllable was also the accented syllable in Sabellic, and since accent sensitive rules are somewhat more common than syllable counting rules, I see no reason not to prefer the formulation given in the text.